# Higher order terms and locality in metamaterial homogenization

Christopher A. Dirdal,[1] Hans Olaf Hågenvik,[1] Haakon Aamot Haave,[1] and Johannes Skaar[1]

[1] *Department of Electronics and Telecommunications, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, NO-7491 Trondheim, Norway*

(Dated: January 9, 2017)

The higher order terms in the expansion of the macroscopic polarization, above the electrical quadrupole, are commonly neglected in metamaterial homogenization due to their typically small magnitudes. We show that they nevertheless are generally significant when second order spatial dispersive effects, such as the magnetic response, are considered. In this respect, they are generally equally important as the polarization, magnetization and quadrupole terms, and should not be neglected. The article discussions are facilitated by both analytical approaches and numerical simulations using the plane wave expansion method for the case of a distributed plane wave source. In addition, a special case is examined where the inclusion of these higher order terms leads to effective permittivity and permeability parameters which are in some sense maximally local.

PACS numbers: 78.67.Pt, 78.20.Ci, 78.20.-e, 42.25.Bs, 41.20.Jb, 42.70.-a,42.70.Qs, 41.20.-q

arXiv:1701.01708v1 [physics.optics] 6 Jan 2017

## I. INTRODUCTION

The structural freedom in metamaterials have spurred renewed interest into homogenization theories. These are theories that allow for the formulation of *effective* macroscopic Maxwell's equations in structured media from the *exact* microscopic ones. The macroscopic equations have effective plane wave solutions in materials with complex structures, where dimensions are well below the wavelength. Despite the similarities between conventional and metamaterial homogenization, it has become evident that certain differences need to be taken into consideration [1–9]; in particular, the importance of spatial dispersion. In this paper we would like to add another characteristic feature of metamaterial homogenization to the list: That higher order terms in the expansion of macroscopic polarization, *above the electric quadrupole*, generally have physical significance with respect to the magnetic response of the system, despite often being far smaller in magnitude than the lower orders. Hence, some of the underlying assumptions regarding the non-importance of the electrical quadrupole *and higher order terms* in both classical [10–13] and more recent [2, 3, 8, 9] treatments on homogenization, should in some cases be reconsidered when applied to metamaterials.

Faced with the wide variety of proposed homogenization theories in literature, it seems reasonable to make classical formulations by Landau-Lifshitz, Casimir, Russakoff and Jackson [10–14] our starting point, which have parallels among more recent metamaterial treatments such as [2, 8]. The article is structured in the following manner: In Sec. II we present the needed background on the homogenization procedure and the multipoles of the macroscopic polarization according to Russakoff-Jackson homogenization [12, 13]. Section III then presents the needed background on the constitutive relations between the macroscpic fields and multipole quantities, as well as the effective permeability and permittivity functions of the Casimir and Landau-Lifshitz formulations [11, 14]. Both of these sections lead up to Sec. IV where we demonstrate how the higher order terms, *above the electric quadrupole*, may be of general importance. Analytical results and simulations are shown. Finally Sec. V, as a side-remark, presents an interesting case where the inclusion of the higher order terms leads to increased locality of the effective permittivity and permeability.

## II. HOMOGENIZATION AND MULTIPOLES

The microscopic Maxwell's equations are

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{r}) = i\omega \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{r}), \tag{1a}$$

$$\nabla \times \frac{\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{r})}{\mu_0} = -i\omega\epsilon_0 \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{r}) + \mathbf{j}(\mathbf{r}) + \mathbf{J}_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r}), \tag{1b}$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\varrho(\mathbf{r}) + \rho_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r})}{\epsilon_0}, \tag{1c}$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{r}) = 0, \tag{1d}$$

where $\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{r})$ and $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{r})$ represent the microscopic electric field and magnetic flux density, respectively, $\mathbf{j}(\mathbf{r})$ and $\varrho(\mathbf{r})$ represent the induced current and charge densities, respectively, and $\mathbf{J}_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r})$ and $\rho_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r})$ represent the source current and charge densities. Harmonic fields with angular frequency $\omega$ have been assumed, and the $\mathrm{e}^{-i\omega t}$ dependence is suppressed. For simplicity, we will throughout this article consider structures consisting of non-magnetic inclusions. While generalization is not very complicated, the simplifications lead to more transparent expressions. The medium is assumed to be passive (or in thermal equilibrium in the absence of the field under study [11]), i.e., we exclude gain media.

The homogenization method described in Russakoff [12] and Jackson [13] can be applied relatively straightforwardly to the case of metamaterials, replacing molecules by metamaterial cells. The cells can be those resulting from a partition of the metamaterial into small volumes (compared to the spatial variation of the source). For the special case where the metamaterial is a periodic structure, the cells are chosen to be the smallest unit cells.

The Russakoff-Jackson formulation of effective, macroscopic fields relies on an averaging procedure of the form

$$\langle F(\mathbf{r})\rangle = \int f(\mathbf{r}')F(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}')\mathrm{d}^3r', \tag{2}$$

where $F$ is the function to be averaged, and $f(\mathbf{r})$ is an arbitrary test function that varies slowly over the size of a cell (and may extend over several such cells) [12, 13]. We now specialize to periodic metamaterials, and consider only a single spatial Fourier component of the source, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{J}_{\mathrm{ext}} = \bar{\mathbf{J}}_{\mathrm{ext}}\mathrm{e}^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}, \tag{3a}$$

$$\rho_{\mathrm{ext}} = \overline{\rho}_{\mathrm{ext}}\mathrm{e}^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}, \tag{3b}$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{J}}_{\mathrm{ext}}$ and $\overline{\rho}_{\mathrm{ext}}$ are constant. Then the averaging procedure (2) can be written

$$\langle F(\mathbf{r})\rangle = \bar{F}\mathrm{e}^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}, \tag{4a}$$

where

$$\bar{F} = \frac{f(\mathbf{k})}{V}\int_V F(\mathbf{r})\mathrm{e}^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}\mathrm{d}^3r, \tag{4b}$$

and the integral is taken over the volume of a unit cell $V$ of the periodic medium (see for example [3]). In arriving at this expression we have made use of the fact that the microscopic fields are Bloch waves of the form

$$F(\mathbf{r}) = U_F(\mathbf{r})\mathrm{e}^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}, \tag{5}$$

where $U_F(\mathbf{r})$ has the same periodicity as the metamaterial. Moreover, we have assumed that the test function in (2) is band-limited, or more precisely, its Fourier transform $f(\mathbf{k})$ is required to vanish outside the first Brillouin zone. This is approximately the case for any sufficiently smooth function $f(\mathbf{r})$ which extends over several unit cells. The operation (4b) essentially represents the spatial average of the periodic modulation $U_F(\mathbf{r})$. In the remainder of this article, we will consider small $\mathbf{k}$'s, well inside the first Brillouin zone. Moreover, we choose the test function such that $f(\mathbf{k}) \approx 1$ there. Then the averaging procedure (4) corresponds to that utilized in Refs. [2, 8].

Application of the averaging procedure (4) to (1a)-(1b), and using the fact that $\mathbf{e}\mathrm{e}^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}$ and $\mathbf{b}\mathrm{e}^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}$ are periodic give macroscopic Maxwell's equations

$$i\mathbf{k}\times\mathbf{E} = i\omega\mathbf{B}, \tag{6a}$$

$$i\mathbf{k}\times\frac{\mathbf{B}}{\mu_{\mathbf{0}}} = -i\omega\epsilon_0\mathbf{E} - i\omega\langle\mathbf{p}\rangle + \mathbf{J}_{\mathrm{ext}}, \tag{6b}$$

having identified $\mathbf{j} = -i\omega\mathbf{p}$ and defined macroscopic fields $\mathbf{E} = \langle\mathbf{e}\rangle$ and $\mathbf{B} = \langle\mathbf{b}\rangle$. The effective electromagnetic response of the system is contained in the induced current $-i\omega\langle\mathbf{p}\rangle$, which we shall now expand into multipoles [8, 15]. With the expansion $\exp(-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}) \approx 1 - i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r} - (\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r})^2/2 + O(k^3)$ we obtain from (4) (to the second order in $k$)

$$\langle\mathbf{p}\rangle = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}}{V}\int_V \mathbf{p}\mathrm{e}^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}\mathrm{d}^3r \tag{7}$$

$$= \frac{\mathrm{e}^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}}{V}\cdot\left(\int_V \mathbf{p}\mathrm{d}^3r - i\mathbf{k}\cdot\int_V \mathbf{r}\mathbf{p}\mathrm{d}^3r - \frac{1}{2}\int_V(\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r})^2\mathbf{p}\mathrm{d}^3r\right)$$

$$\equiv \mathbf{P} - \frac{\mathbf{k}\times\mathbf{M}}{\omega} - i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{R}, \tag{8}$$

where

$$\mathbf{P} = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}}{V}\int_V \mathbf{p}\mathrm{d}^3r, \tag{9a}$$

$$\mathbf{M} = -\frac{i\omega}{2}\frac{\mathrm{e}^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}}{V}\int_V \mathbf{r}\times\mathbf{p}\mathrm{d}^3r, \tag{9b}$$

$$\mathbf{Q} = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{e}^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}}{V}\int_V(\mathbf{r}\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{p}\mathbf{r})\mathrm{d}^3r, \tag{9c}$$

$$\mathbf{R} = -\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{e}^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}}{V}\int_V(\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r})^2\mathbf{p}\mathrm{d}^3r. \tag{9d}$$

and we have decomposed the tensor $\mathbf{rp}$ into its antisymmetric and symmetric parts,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}\mathbf{p} &= \mathbf{k}\cdot(\mathbf{r}\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{p}\mathbf{r})/2 + \mathbf{k}\cdot(\mathbf{r}\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{p}\mathbf{r})/2\\ &= -\mathbf{k}\times\mathbf{r}\times\mathbf{p}/2 + \mathbf{k}\cdot(\mathbf{r}\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{p}\mathbf{r})/2.\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

In addition to the polarization vector $\mathbf{P}$, magnetization vector $\mathbf{M}$, and quadrupole tensor $\mathbf{Q}$, we have included an extra term $\mathbf{R}$ which denotes the so-called *higher order terms* discussed in the introduction, corresponding to electric octupole and magnetic quadrupole. In the following, we will often combine $\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{Q}$ into a combined tensor $\mathbf{Q}^{\mathrm{tot}}$:

$$\mathbf{Q}^{\mathrm{tot}} = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}}{V}\int_V \mathbf{r}\mathbf{p}\mathrm{d}^3r, \tag{11}$$

such that

$$i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{Q}^{\mathrm{tot}} = \frac{\mathbf{k}\times\mathbf{M}}{\omega} + i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{Q}. \tag{12}$$

## III. CONSTITUTIVE RELATIONS

The aim of a homogenization procedure is often to arrive at effective parameters or tensors $\epsilon$ and $\mu$ that describe the effective electromagnetic response of a linear metamaterial. In the so-called Casimir formulation,

$$\epsilon'(\omega,\mathbf{k})\epsilon_0\mathbf{E} = \epsilon_0\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{P}, \tag{13a}$$

$$[1-\mu'^{-1}(\omega,\mathbf{k})]\mathbf{B} = \mu_0\mathbf{M}. \tag{13b}$$

The Casimir formulation thus places $\langle\mathbf{p}\rangle$ *partially* in a permittivity $\epsilon'(\omega,\mathbf{k})$ and *partially* in $1-\mu'^{-1}(\omega,\mathbf{k})$, where $\mu'(\omega,\mathbf{k})$ is a permeability. Evidently the terms $-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{Q}$

and $\mathbf{R}$ in (8) have been excluded in this definition, although sometimes $i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{Q}$ is included in the permittivity [14].

Another possible effective parameter definition is [11]

$$\epsilon_0\epsilon(\omega,\mathbf{k})\mathbf{E} = \epsilon_0\mathbf{E} + \langle\mathbf{p}\rangle, \tag{14}$$

where *all* of $\langle\mathbf{p}\rangle$, including $\mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{R}$, is described by a total permittivity $\epsilon(\omega,\mathbf{k})$. This is called the Landau-Lifshitz formulation, and was used e.g. by Silveirinha [2]. We shall proceed with the Landau-Lifshitz formulation, and return to the Casimir formulation later on.

In a linear medium, we can express multipole densities (9) with constitutive relations

$$P_i = \epsilon_0\chi_{ij}E_j + \xi_{ikj}k_kE_j + \eta_{iklj}k_kk_lE_j, \tag{15a}$$
$$Q^{\text{tot}}_{ik} = i\zeta_{ikj}E_j + i\gamma_{iklj}k_lE_j, \tag{15b}$$
$$R_i = \psi_{iklj}k_kk_lE_j, \tag{15c}$$

where summation over repeated indices is implied. In (15) we have included the necessary orders of $k$ such that $\langle\mathbf{p}\rangle$ is second order in $k$ upon their insertion in (8). Magneto-electric coupling is included in terms of the tensor elements $\xi_{ikj}$ and $\zeta_{ikj}$. From (8), (14) and (15) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon_{ij}(\omega,\mathbf{k}) - \delta_{ij} = \chi_{ij} + (\xi_{ikj} + \zeta_{ikj})k_k/\epsilon_0 \\ + (\psi_{iklj} + \gamma_{iklj} + \eta_{iklj})k_kk_l/\epsilon_0.\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

While it may be convenient to have only a single constitutive tensor $\epsilon(\omega,\mathbf{k})$, it is often desirable to express the magnetic response more explicitly by introducing a permeability tensor. It is well known that the permeability is related to the second order term in (16) [2, 11]. Observe that the macroscopic quantities $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{E}$ are left invariant upon the transformation

$$-i\omega\langle\mathbf{p}\rangle \to -i\omega\hat{\mathbf{P}} + i\mathbf{k}\times\hat{\mathbf{M}}, \tag{17}$$

where the new polarization $\hat{\mathbf{P}}$ and magnetization $\hat{\mathbf{M}}$ are arbitrarily chosen. We can express the left hand side in terms of the non-local tensor $\epsilon(\omega,\mathbf{k})$ by (14), and the right hand side in terms of two new tensors $\epsilon$ and $1-\mu^{-1}$, in order to obtain

$$\epsilon(\omega,\mathbf{k}) = \epsilon - \frac{c^2}{\omega^2}\mathbf{k}\times[1-\mu^{-1}]\times\mathbf{k}. \tag{18}$$

Here, we have used $\hat{\mathbf{M}} = \mu_0^{-1}(1-\mu^{-1})\mathbf{B}$ and (6a). If we choose the coordinate system such that $\mathbf{k} = k\hat{\mathbf{x}}$, then (18) may be expressed

$$\epsilon(\omega,\mathbf{k}) = \epsilon + \frac{k^2c^2}{\omega^2}\begin{bmatrix}0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & (1-\mu^{-1})_{33} & -(1-\mu^{-1})_{32}\\ 0 & -(1-\mu^{-1})_{23} & (1-\mu^{-1})_{22}\end{bmatrix}. \tag{19}$$

We now assume a non-gyrotropic medium[1], such that the first order term in (16) vanishes. Comparing (19) with (16) lets us find

$$1-\mu^{-1} = \omega^2\mu_0\cdot \tag{20}$$
$$\begin{bmatrix}\cdot & \cdot & \cdot\\ \cdot & (\psi_{3113}+\gamma_{3113}+\eta_{3113}) & -(\psi_{3112}+\gamma_{3112}+\eta_{3112})\\ \cdot & -(\psi_{2113}+\gamma_{2113}+\eta_{2113}) & (\psi_{2112}+\gamma_{2112}+\eta_{2112})\end{bmatrix},$$

if we choose to put $\epsilon_{22} = 1+\chi_{22}$, $\epsilon_{33} = 1+\chi_{33}$, $\epsilon_{23} = \chi_{23}$, and $\epsilon_{32} = \chi_{32}$. The missing entries in (20) are a result of the fact that $\mathbf{B}$ is transverse, $\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{B} = 0$, and that only the transversal part of $\hat{\mathbf{M}}$ contributes to the induced current.

In principle the magnetization and therefore permeability can be defined in an infinite number of ways, by including any given part of the transversal, induced current. However, the above identification is somewhat natural, as the magnetization term includes all transversal, induced current, except a part possibly induced by the longitudinal component of the electric field. Eq. (20) is a generalization of the relation in Ref. [2]. Note that the Casimir permeability is related to part of the $\gamma_{ikjl}$ tensor, and may therefore also be viewed as a second order spatial dispersion effect.

## IV. IMPORTANCE OF HIGHER ORDER TERMS

The tensors $\psi$, $\gamma$ and $\eta$ relate to $\mathbf{R}$, $\mathbf{Q}^{\text{tot}}$ and $\mathbf{P}$, respectively, in the manner shown in (15). As seen in (16) these contribute on an equal footing to the second order effects of $\epsilon(\omega,\mathbf{k})$ [6], which may be interpreted as describing the magnetic response of the system according to (20). While it is known that the quadrupole tensor $\mathbf{Q}$ may be significant [4, 5], we shall now show that $\mathbf{R}$ too is generally physically important.

Despite the common practice of neglecting $\mathbf{R}$, and therefore $\psi$, in the multipole expansion (8), the tensors $\psi$, $\gamma/2$ and $\eta$ often turn out to be on the same order of magnitude for metamaterial structures. Before demonstrating this from numerical simulations, we may first gain some further intuition by considering (9) and (11)

[1] For non-gyrotropic media, i.e., when there exists a center of symmetry, we have $\epsilon(\omega,-\mathbf{k}) = \epsilon(\omega,\mathbf{k})$ [10, 11], which implies that odd-order terms in (16) must be zero. Note that there is no way to distinguish between $\xi_{ikj}$ and $\zeta_{ikj}$ in the expression for $\epsilon_{ij}(\omega,\mathbf{k})$; only the sum appears. In other words, even though the microscopic physics may be dependent on these tensors separately, only the sum matters for the macroscopic fields $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$. A similar comment is valid when considering $\psi_{iklj}+\gamma_{iklj}+\eta_{iklj}$; only the sum matters macroscopically. We could for instance therefore choose to put $\psi_{iklj} = \eta_{iklj} = 0$ and include their contribution in $\gamma_{iklj}$, without altering $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$.

for a plane-wave dependence of the field[2]

$$\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{r}) = \overline{E}\mathrm{e}^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}\hat{\mathbf{y}}, \tag{21}$$

and $\mathbf{k} = k\hat{\mathbf{x}}$. The following relationship may then be observed

$$\frac{2R_2}{k^2E_2} = i\frac{\partial}{\partial k}\left\{\frac{Q_{21}^{\mathrm{tot}}}{E_2}\right\} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial k^2}\left\{\frac{P_2}{E_2}\right\}, \tag{22}$$

which gives

$$\psi_{2112} = -\frac{\gamma_{2112}}{2} = \eta_{2112} \tag{23}$$

when compared with (15). Here $\psi_{2112}$ is proportional with the quantity $R_2/E_2$, while $\gamma_{2112}$ is related to the first order k-dependence of the quantity $Q_{21}^{\mathrm{tot}}/E_2$, and $\eta_{2112}$ is related with the second order $k$-dependence of the quantity $P_2/E_2$. With this in mind we may qualify the physical importance of $\mathbf{R}$. From (8) and (9) it is evident that the magnitude of $\mathbf{R}$ may not be significant in comparison to the terms associated with $\mathbf{P}$, $\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{Q}$, since $\mathbf{R}$ results from a higher order term of the exponential in $\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}$. Nevertheless, this does not mean that it is insignificant when the *second order effects* of $\epsilon(\omega, \mathbf{k})$ (i.e. the magnetic response) are concerned, as seen from (22)-(23). Before moving on, note that since $\mathbf{k} \perp \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{r})$ due to (21), one finds using (10) that

$$\frac{\mathbf{k}\times\mathbf{M}}{\omega} = i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{Q}, \tag{24}$$

revealing that $\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{Q}$ contribute equally to $\gamma_{iklj}$ in (15b).

Let us now consider $\psi_{2112}$, $\gamma_{2112}$ and $\eta_{2112}$ for a metamaterial consisting of periodically arranged dielectric cylinders in vacuum. These parameters give the component $\mu_{33}$ according to (20). The microscopic dielectric function $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r})$ in a unit cell is displayed in Fig. 1a. Solving the multiple unknowns in (15) generally requires multiple equations. We therefore calculate $\mathbf{E}$, $\mathbf{P}$, $\mathbf{Q}^{\mathrm{tot}}$, and $\mathbf{R}$ by solving $\mathbf{p} = \epsilon_0(\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) - 1)\mathbf{e}$ for two choices of $\bar{\mathbf{J}}_{\mathrm{ext}}$, perpendicular and parallel to $\mathbf{k}$, respectively. Utilizing the Floquet property of the source (3) and field (5), a plane wave expansion method can be used to solve the wave equation

$$\nabla\times\nabla\times\mathbf{e} - \frac{\omega^2}{c^2}\varepsilon(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{e} = i\omega\mu_0\mathbf{J}_{\mathrm{ext}}, \tag{25}$$

by inserting Fourier series representations of $\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{r})$, $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r})$, and $\mathbf{J}_{\mathrm{ext}}(\mathbf{r})$. Solutions for the microscopic field $\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{r})$ are then readily found numerically for a given number of Fourier coefficients in the series representations. In order to extract the coefficient parameters in (15), the field quantities $\mathbf{E}$, $\mathbf{P}$, $\mathbf{Q}^{\mathrm{tot}}$, and $\mathbf{R}$ are calculated for three values of $k$ so that first and second order derivatives wrt. $k$ of appropriate quantities can be obtained. By application of this method to the dielectric cylinder in Fig. 1a, the parameter values displayed in Table I are obtained. Here we use normalized parameters: Frequency $\omega a/c = 0.2\pi$ and wavevector $\mathbf{k}a = 0.2\hat{\mathbf{x}}$. We have used $91\times 91 = 8281$ spatial harmonics. We observe that $\psi_{2112}$, $\gamma_{2112}/2$ and $\eta_{2112}$ are all on the same order of magnitude, similar to what was found in (23). Using a finite number of spatial harmonics corresponds to performing a *low-pass filtering* of Fig. 1a. The selection of spatial harmonics is performed by a truncation and subsequent application of a Blackman-Harris window in the Fourier domain. Thus, the *actual* structure corresponding to the parameter values in Table I is found by inverse-Fourier transforming the finite coefficient series representation of $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r})$, as given in Fig. 1b: An annulus with slightly rounded edges.

| | |
|---|---|
| $\psi_{2112}/\epsilon_0 a^2$ | $-0.060$ |
| $\gamma_{2112}/\epsilon_0 a^2$ | $0.19$ |
| $\eta_{2112}/\epsilon_0 a^2$ | $-0.048$ |

TABLE I: Parameter values in (15) for dielectric annulus.

Using (20) we may calculate

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \mu_{33}^{-1} &= \left(\frac{\omega a}{c}\right)^2\left(\frac{\psi_{2112}}{\epsilon_0 a^2} + \frac{\gamma_{2112}}{\epsilon_0 a^2} + \frac{\eta_{2112}}{\epsilon_0 a^2}\right) \\ &= 0.0345, \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

for the periodic cylinder metamaterial having inserted the simulation values. Eq. (26) allows us to observe the physical importance of $\mathbf{R}$: Since the parameter $\psi_{2112}$ is on the same order of magnitude as $\eta_{2112}$ and $\gamma_{2112}/2$, one cannot neglect $\mathbf{R}$ without incurring significant error. Also note that the second order term of $\mathbf{P}$ should not be neglected.

Consider Fig. 2, which shows the real and imaginary part of the microscopic polarization $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{r})$ in the dielectric annulus. We may interpret the imaginary and real parts as originating individually from the first and second terms in the expansion of the source (3) for $ka \ll 1$, respectively:

$$\mathbf{J}_{\mathrm{ext}} \approx \bar{\mathbf{J}}_{\mathrm{ext}} + i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}\bar{\mathbf{J}}_{\mathrm{ext}} + O(k^2). \tag{27}$$

For the values in Table I the source amplitude $\bar{\mathbf{J}}_{\mathrm{ext}}$ has been chosen to be real, and from (25) one observes that if both $\mathbf{J}_{\mathrm{ext}}$ and $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r})$ are real, then $\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{r})$ and $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{r}) = \epsilon_0(\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) - 1)\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{r})$ are imaginary. Hence Fig. 2b corresponds with the first, constant source term in the expansion (27). Similarly, the field distribution in Fig. 2a thus arises from the second, nonconstant source term, and is less dominant due to $ka \ll 1$. From (4) and (9)

[2] The wave equation (25) reveals that this solution is approached for a source $\mathbf{J}_{\mathrm{ext}} = \overline{J}_{\mathrm{ext}}\mathrm{e}^{ikx}\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ in the limit $\omega \ll ck$. Alternatively, the solution is approached for high frequencies where the permittivity tends to unity.




(a)




(b)

FIG. 1: (a) Dielectric annulus in vacuum with microscopic permittivity $\varepsilon = 16$. (b) Inverse Fourier transform of finite series representation of $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r})$, having used $91 \times 91$ coefficients. As a result of having used a finite number of coefficients, the edges become smoothened, corresponding to low-pass filtering of (a).




(a) Re $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{r})$




(b) Im $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{r})$

FIG. 2: Real and imaginary parts of the microscopic polarization $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{r})$ in the dielectric annulus in Fig. 1. The vectors in (b) have been minimized by a factor 50 for comparison with (a); i.e. the imaginary part of $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{r})$ dominates.

| | |
|---|---|
| $\psi_{2112}/\epsilon_0 a^2$ | $-0.066 - i0.048$ |
| $\gamma_{2112}/\epsilon_0 a^2$ | $0.011 + i0.17$ |
| $\eta_{2112}/\epsilon_0 a^2$ | $-0.055 - i0.023$ |

TABLE II: Parameter values in (15) for a (poorly) conducting annulus of the same geometry as that pictured in Fig. 1.

it therefore follows that $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{P}$ are dominated by their imaginary parts, and it follows from (15) that the parameters $\psi_{2112}, \gamma_{2112}$ and $\eta_{2112}$ are then dominated by their *real* parts for the dielectric annulus.

In metamaterial applications it is most often of interest to work with inclusions made of conducting materials, rather than purely dielectric structures such as those considered so far. To model this we consider a complex microscopic permittivity

$$\varepsilon = 1 + i16, \tag{28}$$

within the same ring structure as pictured in Fig. 1a. Applying otherwise the same parameters as those leading to Table I, now yields the numerical values of Table II.

Now that $\varepsilon$ is complex, the real and imaginary parts of the microscopic polarization $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{r})$ each arise from a *combination* of the source terms $\bar{\mathbf{J}}_{\text{ext}}$ and $i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}\bar{\mathbf{J}}_{\text{ext}}$, as may be seen from (25). Hence Re $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{r})$ and Im $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{r})$ are roughly on the same order of magnitude, and therefore so are the real and imaginary parts of $\psi_{2112}, \gamma_{2112}/2$ and $\eta_{2112}$.

Assuming dimensions $a \geq 1\mu$m, the relation $\varepsilon = 1 + i\sigma/\epsilon_0\omega$ reveals that the parameter choice (28) and the given normalized frequency correspond with $\sigma \leq$

$2.7 \cdot 10^4$ Sm$^{-1}$. This conductivity is not very large. In the limit that $\sigma \to \infty$, however, we know that the electrostatic field vanishes within the conducting ring, leaving only that part of the field distribution which comes from the nonconstant source term $i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}\bar{\mathbf{J}}_{\text{ext}}$; i.e. a polarization resembling that of Fig. 2a. Such a cylinder-symmetric distribution of $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{r})$ yields $\mathbf{R} = 0$ in (9d), and hence we expect $\psi_{2112} = 0$. More generally, for ideal conductors and $\mathbf{k} = k\hat{\mathbf{x}}$, we expect that the $\mathbf{R}$-term generally remains important, but that it looses importance as the degree of mirror-symmetry about the $yz$-plane increases.

## V. INCREASED LOCALITY FOR CASIMIR FORMULATION

We conclude this article with some side remarks regarding the influence of the higher order terms on the locality of the effective parameters. Local parameters $\epsilon$ and $\mu$ are desirable, since they enable the use of Fresnel equations to describe the behavior of finite samples or layered samples. The permittivity and permeability resulting from the Landau-Lifshitz formulation are therefore appealing, since they in some sense are maximally local[3]. In the Casimir formulation, however, the parameters $\epsilon'$ and $\mu'$ according to (13) are generally highly nonlocal. In this section, we will examine a special case where *modified* Casimir parameters can nevertheless be made equally local by including the higher order terms $\mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{R}$ in $\epsilon'$ and $\mu'$, and choosing an appropriate coordinate origin.

A coordinate transformation $\mathbf{r} \to \tilde{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_0$, causes the multipole quantities in (8) to mix: Considering for instance the polarization and magnetization vectors, they mix according to

$$\tilde{\mathbf{P}} = [1 - i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}_0 - \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}_0)^2]\mathbf{P}, \tag{29a}$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{M}} = [1 - i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}_0][\mathbf{M} + i\omega\frac{\mathbf{r}_0\times\mathbf{P}}{2}], \tag{29b}$$

where we have kept necessary orders of $k$ such that $\langle\mathbf{p}\rangle$ is second order in $k$ upon their insertion in (8). By combining (13a) and (29a), and noting that $\mathbf{E}$ is invariant under the coordinate transformation, the Casimir permittivity elements, *after* coordinate transformation, is expressed

$$\tilde{\epsilon}'_{ij} - \delta_{ij} = [1 - ik_l r_{0l} - \frac{1}{2}(k_l r_{0l})^2](\epsilon'_{ij} - \delta_{ij}). \tag{30}$$

[3] In particular, for non-gyrotropic, weakly spatially dispersive media, where $\epsilon(\omega, \mathbf{k})$ only contains zeroth and second order terms in $k$, as much as possible of the induced current are represented by a local $\mu$ (20). Under certain circumstances (if the second order term of $\langle\mathbf{p}\rangle$ is perpendicular to $\mathbf{k}$, and this term is independent of the longitudinal part of $\mathbf{E}$), all induced current is described by the permeability. This will e.g. be the case for the 1D example below.

Analogous steps lead to an expression for a coordinate-shifted Casimir permeability $1 - \tilde{\mu}'^{-1}_{ij}$. Since the parameters $\tilde{\epsilon}'_{ij}$ and $1 - \tilde{\mu}'^{-1}_{ij}$ vary with the coordinate shift $\mathbf{r_0}$ as seen in (30), it is in some cases possible to choose a coordinate origin in which the first order $k$-dependence, if any, is cancelled. Coordinate shifts may therefore help in making the parameters more local, as will be observed in the example below.

A special case for which the Casimir parameters can be made maximally local, in the sense mentioned earlier, is obtained by including $\mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{R}$ in modified versions of (13) of the following manner[4]

$$\epsilon_0(\epsilon' - 1)\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{P} - i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{Q}, \tag{31a}$$

$$\frac{\mathbf{k}\times(1 - \mu'^{-1})\mathbf{B}}{\mu_0\omega} = \frac{\mathbf{k}\times\mathbf{M}}{\omega} - \mathbf{R}, \tag{31b}$$

while assuming the plane wave solution of the microscopic field considered in (21) with $\mathbf{k} = k\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ (realistic fields will be considered below in a simulation). We then find

$$\epsilon'_{22} = 1 + \chi_{22} + \frac{k}{\epsilon_0}\left(\xi_{212} + \frac{\zeta_{212}}{2}\right) + \frac{k^2}{\epsilon_0}\left(\eta_{2112} + \frac{\gamma_{2112}}{2}\right), \tag{32a}$$

$$(1 - {\mu'_{33}}^{-1}) = \mu_0\omega^2\left(\frac{\zeta_{212}}{2k} + \psi_{2112} + \frac{\gamma_{2112}}{2}\right), \tag{32b}$$

where we have used (12) and (24) in (15b) to express $\mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{M}$ in terms of the parameters $\zeta_{212}$ and $\gamma_{2112}$. If we assume $\xi_{212} = -\zeta_{212} = 0$ (no magnetoelectric coupling), and make use of (23), we obtain $\mathbf{k}$-independent parameters within the frame of second order dispersion treated in this article: $\epsilon'_{22} = 1 + \chi_{22}$ and $1 - {\mu'_{33}}^{-1} = 0$. In other words, the Casimir parameters have become even more local due to the inclusion of contributions from $\mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{R}$ in the definitions (31).

Let us now apply the modified Casimir parameters (31) to a realistic system: Consider a 1D metamaterial consisting of periodically alternating layers (a unit cell of which is displayed in Fig. 3) for frequency $\omega a/c = 0.009$, wavevector $\mathbf{k}a = 0.01\hat{\mathbf{x}}$, and equal layer thicknesses. The source $\mathbf{J}_{\text{ext}}$ and field $\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{r})$ point along $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$, and thus $\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{Q}$ contribute equally to $\gamma_{iklj}$ since $\mathbf{k} \perp \mathbf{p}$, in accordance with (24). Instead of the plane wave expansion method described earlier, the simplicity of the system allows us to find an exact solution to the wave equation (25) in terms of a matrix approach making use of the boundary conditions and the Bloch property of the fields. The results of the simulation are presented in Table III, where we observe that $\psi_{2112}$, $\gamma_{2112}/2$ and $\eta_{2112}$ follow (23). In

[4] Note that these expressions apply to the case where $\mathbf{R} \perp \mathbf{k}$, i.e., when it is possible to describe the entire $\mathbf{R}$-contribution in terms of $1 - \mu'^{-1}$.

terms of the scaled parameters we may express (32) as

$$\epsilon'_{22} = 1 + \chi_{22} + (ka)\left(\frac{\xi_{212}}{a\epsilon_0} + \frac{\zeta_{212}}{2a\epsilon_0}\right) + (ka)^2\left(\frac{\eta_{2112}}{\epsilon_0 a^2} + \frac{\gamma_{2112}}{2\epsilon_0 a^2}\right),$$
$$(1 - {\mu'_{33}}^{-1}) = \left(\frac{\omega a}{c}\right)^2\left(\frac{\zeta_{212}}{2(ka)\epsilon_0 a} + \frac{\psi_{2112}}{\epsilon_0 a^2} + \frac{\gamma_{2112}}{2\epsilon_0 a^2}\right) \quad (33)$$

Inserting the simulation values in the above relation reveals that the magnitudes of $\xi_{212}$ and $\zeta_{212}$ are negligible. This is due to the choice of coordinate origin in the unit cell (Fig. 3): It corresponds to that $r_0$ which gives a zero first order derivative of (30) for $k = 0$, when assuming (21). A slight shift of the coordinate origin away from $r_0 = 0.75a$ renders $\xi_{212} = -\zeta_{212}$ significant (e.g. if the coordinate origin is located at $0.76a$ one obtains $\xi_{212} = -\zeta_{212} = -0.075i$).




FIG. 3: Unit cell of a layered medium (1D metamaterial) which extends infinitely to the left and right

| | |
|---|---|
| $\chi$ | 7.50 |
| $\xi/\varepsilon_0 a$ | $i4.75 \cdot 10^{-9}$ |
| $\zeta/\varepsilon_0 a$ | $-i3.76 \cdot 10^{-17}$ |
| $\psi/\varepsilon_0 a^2$ | $-0.0782$ |
| $\gamma/\varepsilon_0 a^2$ | 0.1563 |
| $\eta/\varepsilon_0 a^2$ | $-0.0782$ |

TABLE III: Parameter values in (15) for the 1D metamaterial displayed in Fig. 3.

Comparing the modified Casimir parameters (32) with the Landau-Lifshitz parameters $\epsilon_{22}$ and $1 - \mu_{33}^{-1}$ defined by (20),

$$\epsilon_{22} = 1 + \chi_{22}, \quad (34a)$$
$$(1 - \mu_{33}^{-1}) = \mu_0\omega^2(\psi_{2112} + \gamma_{2112} + \eta_{2112}), \quad (34b)$$

reveals that $\epsilon'_{22} = \epsilon_{22}$ and $\mu'^{-1}_{33} = \mu^{-1}_{33}$ when (23) and $\xi_{212} = -\zeta_{212} = 0$ apply. In other words, when we evaluate the Landau-Lifshitz and modified Casimir permeabilities they give identical values in this case (*almost identical* in the case of the layered metamaterial of Fig. 3). If we consider the Landau-Lifshitz parameter as the benchmark for local parameters, the modified Casimir parameter has in this sense become maximally local.

Although (32) and (34) yield identical results in the above case, they have different expressions. This indicates that the manner in which we have included $\mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{R}$ into modified Casimir parameters is not unique.

## VI. CONCLUSION

When concerned with spatial dispersive effects of the second order in $k$ (i.e. magnetic response), it has been shown that the higher order multipoles *above* the electrical quadrupole are significant. They generally contribute with the same magnitude as do the polarization, magnetization and electrical quadrupole multipoles, and should therefore not be neglected, despite the higher order multipoles themselves generally being of smaller magnitude. This has been demonstrated in simulations on metamaterials consisting of periodic arrays of dielectric or conducting cylinders, and analytical findings have been provided in the special case where plane wave fields can be assumed. The plane wave expansion method in the case of a distributed plane wave source has been used to provide the relevant simulation results. A case example has been given where maximally local Casimir parameters are achieved by the inclusion of the higher order multipoles.

To facilitate our discussions we have utilized the classical scheme of Russakoff-Jackson homogenization, and effective parameter formulations by Landau-Lifshitz, and Casimir.

[1] A. P. Vinogradov and A. V. Aivazyan, Phys. Rev. E **60**, 987 (1999).
[2] M. G. Silveirinha, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 115104 (2007).
[3] M. G. Silveirinha, in *Metamaterials Handbook: Theory and phenomena of metamaterials*, edited by F. Capolino (CRC Press, London, 2009) Chap. 10.

[4] D. J. Cho, F. Wang, X. Zhang, and Y. R. Shen, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 121101 (2008).
[5] J. Petschulat, C. Menzel, A. Chipouline, C. Rockstuhl, A. Tünnermann, F. Lederer, and T. Pertsch, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 043811 (2008).
[6] C. Simovski and S. Tretyakov, in *Metamaterials Handbook: Theory and Phenomena of Metamaterials*, edited by F. Capolino (CRC Press, London, 2009) Chap. 2.
[7] A. Alù, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 081102 (2011).
[8] A. Alù, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 075153 (2011).
[9] A. D. Yaghjian, A. Alù, and M. G. Silveirinha, Photonics and Nanostructures - Fundamentals and Applications **11**, 374 (2013).
[10] V. Agranovich and V. Ginzburg, *Crystal optics with spatial dispersion, and excitons:*, Springer series in solid-state sciences (Springer-Verlag, 1984).
[11] L. D. Landau, E. M. Lifshitz, and L. P. Pitaevskii, *Electrodynamics of continuous media* (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1984).
[12] G. Russakoff, Am. J. Phys. **38**, 1188 (1970).
[13] J. D. Jackson, *Classical electrodynamics*, 3rd ed. (Wiley, New York, 1999).
[14] A. P. Vinogradov, Physics-Uspekhi **45**, 331 (2002).
[15] J. van Bladel, *Electromagnetic fields* (IEEE Press, Hoobken, NJ, 2007).